•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/658,251	LAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey Sharp	3677	
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Per</u>	nding	
(1) <u>Jeffrey Sharp</u> .	(3) Richard Beem.		
(2) <u>Flemming Saether</u> .	(4) <u>Grace Lu</u> .		
Date of Interview: <u>07 October 2004</u>	Time: 11:30 AM Eastern		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: Claims 2, 3, 4			
Claims discussed: Claims 2, 3, and newly added claim 14, which combined claims 2 Claim 4 deemed allowable over the prior art due to limiting dimen		s.	
Prior art documents discussed: See Continuation Sheet			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.			
☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate red did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary	ecord of the substance of the γ by the examiner appears in F	interview, since the interview Part II above.	
Flamming Saather			
Primary Examiner (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed:

- Crooks US-2,314,481 shows a strip of fasteners capable of being bent having same dimentions.
- 2) Le Gay US-324,126 shows a 40% short/long leg ratio, and 80% 2d prong lenth/bridge ratio.
- 3) Doan US-717,554 shows a fastener of similar dimensions.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

- 1) Crooks anticipation over 1) leg length ratio and 2) short leg/bridge portion length ratio. Applicant deemed leg length ratio of Crooks to be 19%, and therefore different than 'about 25%'.
- 2) Lack of structure from intended use statement in claim preamble.
- 3) Possibility of considering the combination of the fastener with wire lath.
- 4) Discussion over whether replacing 'about 75% and about 99%' with 'at least 75%' constitutes new matter. It was found that the applicant's originally filed drawings supported that the second prong could be slightly longer than 99% of the bridge portion to allow the end of the prong to touch the first prong, and still allow for some bending length, while not departing from the scope of the claim.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,251	LAT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	1111
	Jeffrey Sharp	3677	\mathcal{W}
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>Allo</u>	<u>wed</u>	
(1) <u>Jeffrey Sharp</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Richard Beem</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: 26 October 2004	Time: <u>12:30</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	int's representative) `		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:			
Claims discussed:			
2, 3, and 14			
Prior art documents discussed:			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Discussed proposed examiner's amendment. Applicant agreed with changes.			
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the interview, since	ne substance
Flemming Saether Primary Examine			
	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appro	opriate)